## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,			
	Plaintiff,		
V.			Case No. 92-CR-80236-DT
FELIX WALLS,			
	Defendant.	_/	

## ORDER GRANTING IN PART DEFENDANT'S JUNE 26, 2006 "MOTION TO SERVE NOTICE THAT NEW COUNSEL HAS BEEN RETAINED"

Pending before the court is Defendant Felix Walls's "Motion to Serve Notice that New Counsel has been Retained," filed on June 26, 2006. The motion serves two purposes. First, it purports to "serve notice" that Defendant Felix Walls has retained David S. Steingold as replacement counsel for his court-appointed attorney. Inasmuch as Attorney Steingold has already filed a notice of appearance (see Dkt. # 607]), Defendant's motion in this regard was unnecessary.

Second, Defendant requests that in light of this substitution, he be granted additional time to file his motion attacking this court's jurisdiction. The court will grant Defendant's motion seeking an extension of time, but only because the court has adjourned Defendant's re-sentencing hearing until **August 1, 2006 at 2:00 p.m.** The court will not allow Defendant to delay this case further. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Defendant's "Motion to Serve Notice that New Counsel has been Retained" [Dkt. # 608] is GRANTED IN PART. Specifically, the court will grant an extension of time for Defendant to file a motion relating to his jurisdictional challenge.

IT IS FURTHER ORDDERED that Defendant shall file any motion attacking this court's jurisdiction by **July 21**, **2006**. The Government shall file its response by **July 28**, **2006**. The court will conduct the hearing on the jurisdictional motion simultaneously with the court's re-sentencing hearing at **August 1**, **2006** at **2:00** p.m.<sup>1</sup>

S/Robert H. Cleland
ROBERT H. CLELAND
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: July 10, 2006

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, July 10, 2006, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Lisa Wagner
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk
(313) 234-5522

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The court expresses no opinion as to the merits of Defendant's jurisdictional challenge. If the motion proves meritorious, the court will cancel the re-sentencing hearing.